arXiv:1703.01635v1 [math.CV] 5 Mar 2017

On Picard Value Problem of Some Difference Polynomials

Zinelâabidine LATREUCH and Benharrat BELAÏDI[1]

Department of Mathematics
Laboratory of Pure and Applied Mathematics
University of Mostaganem (UMAB)
B. P. 227 Mostaganem-(Algeria)
z.latreuch@gmail.com
belaidibenharrat@yahoo.fr

Abstract. In this paper, we study the value distribution of zeros of certain nonlinear difference polynomials of entire functions of finite order.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*:30D35, 39A32.
Key words: Entire functions, Non-linear difference polynomials, Nevanlinna theory, Small function.

1 Introduction and Results

Throughout this paper, we assume that the reader is familiar with the fundamental results and the standard notations of the Nevanlinna's value distribution theory ([1] , [7] , [9]). In addition, we will use $\rho(f)$ to denote the order of growth of f, we say that a meromorphic function $a(z)$ is a small function of $f(z)$ if $T(r,a) = S(r,f)$, where $S(r,f) = o(T(r,f))$, as $r \to +\infty$ outside of a possible exceptional set of finite logarithmic measure, we use $S(f)$ to denote the family of all small functions with respect to $f(z)$. For a meromorphic function $f(z)$, we define its shift by $f_c(z) = f(z+c)$.

In 1959, Hayman proved in [8] that if f is a transcendental entire function, then $f'f^n$ assume every nonzero complex number infinitely many times, provided that $n \geq 2$. Since then, there are many research publications (see [12]) regarding this type of Picard-value problem. In 2007, Laine and

[1]Corresponding author

Yang studied the difference analogue of Hayman's theorem and proved the following result.

Theorem A. ([10]) *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of finite order, and c be a nonzero complex constant. Then for $n \geq 2$, $f^n(z) f(z+c)$ assume every non-zero value $a \in \mathbb{C}$ infinitely often.*

In the same paper, Laine and Yang showed that Theorem A does not remain valid for the case $n = 1$. Indeed, take $f(z) = e^z + 1$. Then

$$f(z) f(z + \pi i) - 1 = (1 + e^z)(1 - e^z) - 1 = -e^{2z}.$$

After their, a stream of studies on the value distribution of nonlinear difference polynomials in f has been launched and many related results have been obtained, see e.g. [2, 10, 11, 12]. For example, Liu and Yand improved the pervious result and obtained the following.

Theorem B. ([10]) *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of finite order, and c be a nonzero complex constant. Then for $n \geq 2$, $f^n(z) f(z+c) - p(z)$ has infinitely many zeros, where $p(z) \not\equiv 0$ is a polynomial in z.*

Hence, it is natural to ask: *What can be said about the value distribution of $f(z) f(z+c) - q$, when f is a transcendental meromorphic function and q be a non-vanishing small function of f?* In this paper, as an attempt in resolving this question, we obtain the following results.

Theorem 1.1 *Let f be a transcendental entire function of finite order, let c_1, c_2 be two nonzero complex numbers such that $f(z + c_1) \not\equiv f(z + c_2)$ and q be non-vanishing polynomial. Then $f(z) f(z + c_1) - q(z)$ and $f(z) f(z + c_2) - q(z)$ at least one of them has infinitely many zeros.*

The following corollaries arise directly from Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.1 *Let α, β, p_1, p_2 and q $(\not\equiv 0)$ be a nonconstant polynomials. Then the system*

$$\begin{cases} f(z) f(z + c_1) - q(z) = p_1(z) e^{\alpha(z)}, \\ f(z) f(z + c_2) - q(z) = p_2(z) e^{\beta(z)} \end{cases}$$

has no transcendental entire solutions for every $c_1 \neq c_2$ complex numbers.

Corollary 1.2 *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of finite order, and c be a nonzero complex constant. Then for $n \geq 1$, $f^n(z) f(z+c) - p(z)$ has infinitely many zeros with at most one exeption, where $p(z) \not\equiv 0$ is a polynomial in z.*

2 Some lemmas

Lemma 2.1 [1] *Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant, finite order meromorphic solution of*

$$f^n P(z,f) = Q(z,f),$$

where $P(z,f), Q(z,f)$ are difference polynomials in $f(z)$ with meromorphic coefficients $a_j(z)$ $(j = 1, \cdots, s)$, and let $\delta < 1$. If the degree of $Q(z,f)$ as a polynomial in $f(z)$ and its shifts is at most n, then

$$m(r, P(z,f)) = o\left(\frac{T(r+|c|, f)}{r^{\delta}}\right) + o(T(r,f)) + O\left(\sum_{j=1}^{s} m(r, a_j)\right).$$

Lemma 2.2 [2] *Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant, finite order meromorphic function and let $c \neq 0$ be an arbitrary complex number. Then*

$$T(r, f(z+c)) = T(r, f(z)) + S(r,f).$$

Lemma 2.3 [4] *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order ρ, and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a given constant. Then, there exists a set $E_0 \subset (1, +\infty)$ that has finite logarithmic measure, such that for all z satisfying $|z| \notin E_0 \cup [0,1]$, and for all k, j, $0 \leq j < k$, we have*

$$\left|\frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{f^{(j)}(z)}\right| \leq |z|^{(k-j)(\rho-1+\varepsilon)}.$$

Lemma 2.4 [7] *Let f be a meromorphic function and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$m\left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f}\right) = S(r,f),$$

where $S(r,f)=O(\log T(r,f)+\log r)$, *possibly outside a set* $E_1\subset[0,+\infty)$ *of a finite linear measure. If* f *is of finite order of growth, then*

$$m\left(r,\frac{f^{(k)}}{f}\right)=O(\log r).$$

Lemma 2.5 [3, 5, 6] *Let* η_1,η_2 *be two arbitrary complex numbers such that* $\eta_1\neq\eta_2$ *and let* $f(z)$ *be a finite order meromorphic function. Let* σ *be the order of* $f(z)$. *Then for each* $\varepsilon>0$, *we have*

$$m\left(r,\frac{f(z+\eta_1)}{f(z+\eta_2)}\right)=O\left(r^{\sigma-1+\varepsilon}\right).$$

Lemma 2.6 *Let* $f(z)$ *be a transcendental meromorphic solution of the system*

$$\begin{cases} f(z)f(z+c_1)-q(z)=p_1(z)e^{\alpha(z)}, \\ f(z)f(z+c_2)-q(z)=p_2(z)e^{\beta(z)}, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where α,β *be a polynomials and* p_1, p_2, q *be a non-vanishing rational functions. If* $N(r,f)=S(r,f)$, *then*

$$\deg\alpha=\deg\beta=\deg(\alpha+\beta)=\rho(f)>0.$$

Proof. First, we prove that $\deg\alpha=\rho(f)$ and by the same we can deduce that $\deg\beta=\rho(f)$. It's clear from (2.1) that $\deg\alpha\leq\rho(f)$. Suppose that $\deg\alpha<\rho(f)$, this means that

$$f(z)f(z+c_1):=F=q(z)+p_1(z)e^{\alpha(z)}\in S(f). \tag{2.2}$$

Applying Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 into (2.2), we obtain $T(r,f_c)=T(r,f)=S(r,f)$ which is a contradiction. Assume now that $\deg(\alpha+\beta)<\rho(f)$, this leads to $p_1p_2e^{\alpha+\beta}\in S(f)$. From this and (2.1) we have

$$f^2P(z,f)=p_1p_2e^{\alpha+\beta}+q^2,$$

where

$$P(z,f)=a(z)f^2-b(z)$$

and

$$a=\frac{f_{c_1}}{f}\frac{f_{c_2}}{f},\ b=q\left(\frac{f_{c_1}}{f}+\frac{f_{c_2}}{f}\right).$$

It's clear that $P(z,f) \not\equiv 0$, and by using Lemma 2.1, we get

$$m(r, P(z,f)) = S(r,f)$$

which leads to

$$2T(r,f) = m\left(r, \frac{b(z) + P(z,f)}{a(z)}\right) = S(r,f)$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\deg(\alpha+\beta) = \deg\alpha = \deg\beta$. Finally, by using Lemma 2.1, it's easy to see that both of α and β are nonconstant polynomials.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We shall prove this theorem by contradiction. Suppose contrary to our assertion that both of $f(z)f(z+c_1) - q(z)$ and $f(z)f(z+c_2) - q(z)$ have finitely many zeros. Then, there exist four polynomials α, β, p_1 and p_2 such that

$$f(z)f(z+c_1) - q(z) = p_1(z)e^{\alpha(z)} \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$f(z)f(z+c_2) - q(z) = p_2(z)e^{\beta(z)}. \tag{3.2}$$

By differentiating (3.1) and eliminating e^{α}, we get

$$A_1 f f_{c_1} - f' f_{c_1} - f f'_{c_1} = B_1, \tag{3.3}$$

where $A_1 = \frac{p_1'}{p_1} + \alpha'$, $B_1 = \left(\frac{p_1'}{p_1} + \alpha'\right)q - q'$. By Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\deg\alpha = \deg\beta = \deg(\alpha+\beta) = \rho(f) > 0.$$

Now, we prove that $A_1 \not\equiv 0$. To show this, we suppose the contrary. Then, there exists a constant A such that $A = p_1(z)e^{\alpha}$, which implies the contradiction $\deg\alpha = \rho(f) = 0$. By the same, we can prove that $B_1 \not\equiv 0$. By the same arguments as above, (3.2) gives

$$A_2 f f_{c_2} - f' f_{c_2} - f f'_{c_2} = B_2, \tag{3.4}$$

where $A_2 = \frac{p_2'}{p_2} + \beta'$ and $B_2 = \left(\frac{p_2'}{p_2} + \beta'\right) q - q'$. Obviously, $A_2 \not\equiv 0$ and $B_2 \not\equiv 0$. Dividing both sides of (3.3) and (3.4) by f^2, we get for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$2m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \leq m\left(r, \frac{f_{c_i}}{f}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f'}{f}\frac{f_{c_i}}{f}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f'_{c_i}}{f_{c_i}}\frac{f_{c_i}}{f}\right) + O\left(\log r\right)$$

$$= O\left(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}\right) + O\left(\log r\right) = S\left(r, f\right).$$

So, by the first fundamental theorem, we deduce that

$$T\left(r, f\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + O\left(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}\right) + O\left(\log r\right). \tag{3.5}$$

It's clear from (3.3) and (3.4) that any multiple zero of f is a zero of B_i $(i = 1, 2)$. Hence

$$N_{(2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{B_i}\right) = O\left(\log r\right),$$

where $N_{(2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)$ denotes the counting function of zeros of f whose multiplicities are not less than 2. It follows by this and (3.5) that

$$T\left(r, f\right) = N_{1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + O\left(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}\right) + O\left(\log r\right), \tag{3.6}$$

where $N_{1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)$ is the counting function of zeros, where only the simple zeros are considered. From (3.3) and (3.4), for every zero z_0 such that $f'\left(z_0\right) \neq 0$ which is not zero or pole of B_1 and B_2, we have

$$\left(f' f_{c_1} + B_1\right)\left(z_0\right) = 0 \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\left(f' f_{c_2} + B_2\right)\left(z_0\right) = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

By (3.7) and (3.8), we obtain

$$\left(B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}\right)\left(z_0\right) = 0 \tag{3.9}$$

which means that the function $\frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f}$ does not have any simple pole. We consider two cases:

Case 1. $B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2} \not\equiv 0$. Set

$$h(z) = \frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f(z)}. \tag{3.10}$$

Then, from the lemma of logarithmic differences, we have $m(r,h) = O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r)$. On the other hand

$$N(r,h) = N\left(r, \frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f}\right) = N_{1)}\left(r, \frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f}\right)$$

$$+O\left(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}\right) + O(\log r) = S(r,f).$$

Thus, $T(r,h) = O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r) = S(r,f)$. From the equation (3.10), we have

$$f_{c_1}(z) = \frac{B_1}{B_2} f_{c_2}(z) + \frac{h}{B_2} f(z). \tag{3.11}$$

By differentiating (3.11), we get

$$f'_{c_1}(z) = \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' f(z) + \frac{h}{B_2} f'(z) + \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' f_{c_2}(z) + \frac{B_1}{B_2} f'_{c_2}(z). \tag{3.12}$$

Substituting (3.11) and (3.12) into (3.3)

$$\left[\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'\right] f^2 + \left[-\frac{2h}{B_2}\right] f f'$$

$$+ \left[\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right] f f_{c_2} - \frac{B_1}{B_2} f' f_{c_2} - \frac{B_1}{B_2} f f'_{c_2} = B_1. \tag{3.13}$$

Equation (3.4), can be rewritten as

$$-\frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} f f_{c_2} + \frac{B_1}{B_2} f' f_{c_2} + \frac{B_1}{B_2} f f'_{c_2} = -B_1.$$

By adding this to (3.13), we get

$$\left[\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'\right] f + \left[-\frac{2h}{B_2}\right] f' + \left[\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2}\right] f_{c_2} = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Its clear that $-\frac{2h}{B_2} \not\equiv 0$. In order to complete the proof of our theorem, we need to prove

$$\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' \not\equiv 0 \text{ and } \frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \not\equiv 0.$$

Suppose contrary to our assertion that $\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' \equiv 0$. Then, by the definition of A_1 and by simple integration, we get

$$p_1 e^{\alpha} = C_1 \frac{h}{B_2},$$

where C_1 is a nonzero constant. This implies that $\deg \alpha = \rho(f) - 1$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' \not\equiv 0$. Next, we shall prove $\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \not\equiv 0$. Suppose that $\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \equiv 0$. Then we obtain

$$\frac{p_1}{p_2} e^{\alpha - \beta} = C_2 \frac{B_1}{B_2} := \gamma,$$

where C_2 is a nonzero constant and γ is a small function of f. From (3.1) and (3.2) we get

$$f(f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}) = (1 - \gamma) q. \tag{3.15}$$

If $\gamma \not\equiv 1$, then by applying Clunie's lemma to (3.15), we obtain

$$m(r, f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}) = T(r, f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}) = S(r, f).$$

By this and (3.15), we have

$$T(r, f) = T\left(r, \frac{(1 - \gamma) q}{f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}}\right) = S(r, f)$$

which is a contradiction. If $\gamma \equiv 1$, then we obtain the contradiction $f_{c_1}(z) \equiv f_{c_2}(z)$. Thus, $\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \not\equiv 0$. From the above discussion and (3.14), we have

$$f_{c_2}(z) = M(z) f(z) + N(z) f'(z) \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$f_{c_1}(z) = \varphi(z) f(z) + \psi(z) f'(z), \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$M=\frac{\left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'-A_1\frac{h}{B_2}}{(A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'},\ N=\frac{\frac{2h}{B_2}}{(A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}$$

and

$$\varphi(z)=\frac{B_1}{B_2}M+\frac{h}{B_2},\ \psi=\frac{B_1}{B_2}N.$$

Differentiation of (3.16), gives

$$f'_{c_2}=M'f+(M+N')f'+Nf''. \tag{3.18}$$

Substituting (3.16) and (3.18) into (3.4), we get

$$[M'-A_2M]f^2+[N'-A_2N+2M]f'f+N\left((f')^2+ff''\right)=-B_2. \tag{3.19}$$

Differentiating (3.19), we get

$$[M'-A_2M]'f^2+\left(2[M'-A_2M]+[N'-A_2N+2M]'\right)f'f$$

$$+(2N'-A_2N+2M)\left((f')^2+ff''\right)+N(3f'f''+ff''')=-B_2'. \tag{3.20}$$

Suppose z_0 is a simple zero of f and not a zero or pole of B_2. Then from (3.19) and (3.20), we have

$$\left(Nf'+\frac{B_2}{f'}\right)(z_0)=0,$$

$$\left[(2N'-A_2N+2M)f'+3Nf''+\frac{B_2'}{f'}\right](z_0)=0.$$

It follows that z_0 is a zero of $[B_2(2N'-A_2N+2M)-B_2'N]f'+3B_2Nf''$. Therefore the function

$$H=\frac{[2B_2N'-B_2A_2N+2B_2M-B_2'N]f'+3B_2Nf''}{f}$$

satisfies $T(r,H)=S(r,f)$ and

$$f''=\frac{H}{3B_2N}f+\frac{[-2B_2N'+B_2A_2N-2B_2M+B_2'N]}{3B_2N}f'. \tag{3.21}$$

Substituting (3.21) into (3.19), we get

$$q_1 f^2 + q_2 f' f + q_3 (f')^2 = -B_2, \tag{3.22}$$

where

$$q_1 = M' - A_2 M + \frac{H}{3B_2},$$

$$q_2 = \frac{1}{3}N' + \frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2} - 2A_2\right) N + \frac{4}{3}M,\ q_3 = N.$$

We prove first $q_2 \not\equiv 0$. Suppose the contrary. Then

$$\frac{q_2}{q_3} = \frac{2}{3}\frac{N'}{N} - \frac{1}{3}\frac{B_2'}{B_2} - \frac{2}{3}(A_1 + A_2) + \frac{2}{3}\frac{h'}{h} = 0$$

which leads to

$$\alpha' + \beta' = \frac{N'}{N} - 2\frac{B_2'}{B_2} + \frac{h'}{h} - \frac{p_1'}{p_1} - \frac{p_2'}{p_2}.$$

By simple integration of both sides of the above equation, we get

$$p_1 p_2 e^{\alpha+\beta} = c\frac{N}{B_2^2}h, \tag{3.23}$$

where c is a nonzero constant, this leads to the contradiction $\deg(\alpha+\beta) < \deg\alpha = \deg\beta$. Hence, $q_2 \not\equiv 0$. Differentiating (3.22), we obtain

$$q_1' f^2 + (2q_1 + q_2') f' f + (q_2 + q_3')(f')^2 + q_2 f'' f + 2q_3 f' f'' = -B_2'. \tag{3.24}$$

Let z_0 be a simple zero of f which is not a zero or pole of B_2. Then from (3.22) and (3.24) we have

$$\left(q_3 f' + \frac{B_2}{f'}\right)(z_0) = 0,$$

$$\left[(q_2 + q_3') f' + 2q_3 f'' + \frac{B_2'}{f'}\right](z_0) = 0.$$

Therefore z_0 is a zero of $(B_2(q_2 + q_3') - B_2' q_3) f' + 2B_2 q_3 f''$. Hence the function

$$R = \frac{(B_2(q_2 + q_3') - B_2' q_3) f' + 2B_2 q_3 f''}{f}.$$

satisfies $T(r,R)=S(r,f)$ and

$$f''=\frac{R}{2B_2q_3}f+\frac{B_2'q_3-B_2\left(q_2+q_3'\right)}{2B_2q_3}f'. \tag{3.25}$$

Substituting (3.25) into (3.22)

$$\left[q_1'+\frac{q_2R}{2B_2q_3}\right]f^2+\left[2q_1+q_2'+\frac{1}{2}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}q_2-\frac{1}{2}\left(q_2+q_3'\right)\frac{q_2}{q_3}+\frac{R}{B_2}\right]f'f$$

$$+\frac{B_2'q_3}{B_2}\left(f'\right)^2=-B_2'. \tag{3.26}$$

Combining (3.26) and (3.21)

$$\left[q_1'+\frac{q_2R}{2B_2q_3}-\frac{B_2'}{B_2}q_1\right]f+\left[2q_1+q_2'-\frac{1}{2}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}q_2-\frac{1}{2}\left(q_2+q_3'\right)\frac{q_2}{q_3}+\frac{R}{B_2}\right]f'=0. \tag{3.27}$$

From (3.27), we deduce that

$$q_1'+\frac{q_2R}{2B_2q_3}-\frac{B_2'}{B_2}q_1=0$$

and

$$2q_1+q_2'-\frac{1}{2}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}q_2-\frac{1}{2}\left(q_2+q_3'\right)\frac{q_2}{q_3}+\frac{R}{B_2}=0.$$

By eliminating R from the above two equations, we obtain

$$q_3\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)\frac{B_2'}{B_2}+q_2\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)-q_3\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)'+q_3'\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)=0. \tag{3.28}$$

Thus, equation (3.25) can be rewritten as

$$f''=\left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\frac{q_1}{q_2}-\frac{q_1'}{q_2}\right)f+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2}-\frac{q_2}{q_3}-\frac{N'}{N}\right)f'. \tag{3.29}$$

Subcase 1. If $4q_1q_3-q_2^2\not\equiv 0$, then from (3.28) we have

$$\frac{q_2}{q_3}=\frac{\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)'}{\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)}-\frac{B_2'}{B_2}-\frac{q_3'}{q_3}.$$

On the other hand

$$\frac{q_2}{q_3}=\frac{1}{3}\frac{N'}{N}+\frac{1}{3}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}-\frac{2}{3}\left(A_1+A_2\right)+\frac{2}{3}\frac{\left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'}{\frac{h}{B_2}}.$$

Hence

$$2\left(A_1+A_2\right)=-3\frac{\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)'}{\left(4q_1q_3-q_2^2\right)}+4\frac{N'}{N}+4\frac{B_2'}{B_2}+2\frac{\left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'}{\frac{h}{B_2}}.$$

By the definition of A_i $(i=1,2)$ and simple integration, we deduce that

$$\deg\left(\alpha+\beta\right)<\deg\alpha=\deg\beta$$

which is a contradiction.

Subcase 2. If $4q_1q_3\equiv q_2^2$, then from (3.29) and (3.21) we have

$$\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\frac{q_1}{q_2}-\frac{q_1'}{q_2}=\frac{H}{3B_2N}. \tag{3.30}$$

On the other hand

$$\frac{q_1}{q_3}-\frac{M'-A_2M}{N}=\frac{H}{3B_2N}. \tag{3.31}$$

Combining (3.30) and (3.31), we obtain

$$\frac{5}{4}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\frac{\left(\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right)'}{\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}$$

$$+\frac{1}{6}\left(\frac{\left(\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right)'}{\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}\right)'-\left(\frac{1}{2}A_1+A_2\right)\frac{\left(\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right)'}{\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}$$

$$-\frac{5}{3}\frac{h'}{h}\frac{\left(\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right)'}{\left(A_1-A_2\right)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}-\frac{5}{6}\left(A_1+A_2\right)\frac{h'}{h}+\frac{23}{12}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\frac{h'}{h}-\frac{5}{4}\left(\frac{h'}{h}\right)^2$$

$$-\frac{1}{9}(A_1+A_2)\frac{\left((A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right)'}{(A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}+\frac{1}{9}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\frac{\left((A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right)'}{(A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}$$

$$+\frac{2}{9}\frac{B_2'}{B_2}(A_1+A_2)-\frac{7}{9}\left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\right)^2-\frac{19}{36}\left(\frac{\left((A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right)'}{(A_1-A_2)\frac{B_1}{B_2}-\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}\right)^2$$

$$-\frac{1}{6}\left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\right)'-\frac{1}{2}A_1'+\frac{1}{3}(A_1'+A_2')+\frac{1}{3}(A_1+A_2)\frac{B_2'}{B_2}+\frac{1}{2}A_2A_1$$

$$=\frac{1}{9}(A_1+A_2)^2.$$

Dividing both sides of the above equation by $\frac{(A_1+A_2)^2}{2}$ and since $\lim_{z\to\infty}\frac{R'(z)}{R(z)}=0$ if R is a nonzero rational function, we obtain

$$\left|\frac{A_2A_1}{(A_1+A_2)^2}-\frac{2}{9}\right|\leq\frac{5}{3}\frac{\left|\frac{h'}{h}\right|}{|A_1+A_2|}+\frac{23}{6}\left|\frac{B_2'}{B_2}\right|\frac{\left|\frac{h'}{h}\right|}{|A_1+A_2|^2}+\frac{5}{2}\frac{\left|\frac{h'}{h}\right|^2}{|A_1+A_2|^2}+o(1) \tag{3.32}$$

On the other hand, since $\rho(h)\leq\rho(f)-1$ and by Lemma 2.3

$$\left|\frac{h'(z)}{h(z)}\right|\leq|z|^{\rho(f)-2+\varepsilon} \tag{3.33}$$

for all z satisfying $|z|\notin E_0\cup[0,1]$ where $E_0\subset(1,\infty)$ a set of finite logarithmic measure. By combining (3.32) and (3.33), we deduce

$$\lim_{\substack{z\to\infty\\ |z|\notin E_0\cup[0,1]}}\frac{A_2A_1}{(A_1+A_2)^2}=\lim_{\substack{z\to\infty\\ |z|\notin E_0\cup[0,1]}}\frac{\alpha'\beta'}{(\alpha'+\beta')^2}=\frac{2}{9}.$$

By setting $\alpha(z)=a_mz^m+\cdots+a_0$ and $\beta(z)=b_mz^m+\cdots+b_0$, we deduce

$$\lim_{\substack{z\to\infty\\ |z|\notin E_0\cup[0,1]}}\frac{\alpha'\beta'}{(\alpha'+\beta')^2}=\frac{a_mb_m}{(a_m+b_m)^2}=\frac{2}{9}$$

which implies that $\frac{a_m}{b_m}=2$ or $\frac{1}{2}$. We consider first the case $\frac{a_m}{b_m}=\frac{1}{2}$, we get from (3.1) and (3.17)

$$\varphi f^2+\psi f'f-q=Ae^{\frac{1}{2}b_mz^m} \tag{3.34}$$

and

$$Mf^2 + Nf'f - q = Be^{b_m z^m}, \tag{3.35}$$

where $A = p_1 e^{a_{m-1}z^{m-1}+\cdots+a_0}$ and $B = p_2 e^{b_{m-1}z^{m-1}+\cdots+b_0}$. From (3.34) and (3.35) , we get

$$\varphi f^2 + \psi f'f = q + A\left(\frac{Mf^2 + Nf'f - q}{B}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence

$$\varphi f + \psi f' = \frac{q}{f} + A\left(\frac{Mf^2 + Nf'f - q}{Bf^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore

$$T(r, \varphi f + \psi f') = m(r, \varphi f + \psi f') + S(r, f)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{E_1} \log^+ \left|\varphi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f\left(re^{i\theta}\right) + \psi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f'\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right| d\theta$$

$$+\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{E_2} \log^+ \left|\varphi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f\left(re^{i\theta}\right) + \psi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f'\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right| d\theta + S(r, f),$$

where $E_1 = \left\{\theta : \left|f\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right| \leq 1\right\}$ and $E_2 = \left\{\theta : \left|f\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right| > 1\right\}$. Now

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{E_1} \log^+ \left|\varphi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f\left(re^{i\theta}\right) + \psi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f'\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right| d\theta$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{E_1} \log^+ \left|f'\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right| d\theta + S(r, f)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{E_1} \log^+ \left|\frac{f'\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}{f\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}\right| d\theta + S(r, f) = S(r, f).$$

On the other hand

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{E_2} \log^+ \left|\varphi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f\left(re^{i\theta}\right) + \psi\left(re^{i\theta}\right) f'\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right| d\theta$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{E_2} \log^+ \left|\frac{q\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}{f\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}\right| d\theta$$

$$+\frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{E_2} \log^+ \left|\frac{M\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}{B\left(re^{i\theta}\right)} + \frac{N\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}{B\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}\frac{f'\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}{f\left(re^{i\theta}\right)} - \frac{q\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}{f^2\left(re^{i\theta}\right)}\right| d\theta + S(r, f) = S(r, f).$$

Hence

$$T(r, f_{c_1}) = T(r, \varphi f + \psi f') = S(r, f)$$

which is a contradiction. If $\frac{a_m}{b_m} = 2$, then by the same argument we have

$$Mf^2 + Nf'f = q + B\left(\frac{\varphi f^2 + \psi f' f - q}{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

which implies the contradiction

$$T(r, f_{c_2}) = T(r, Mf + Nf') = S(r, f).$$

Case 2. $B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2} \equiv 0$, by using the same arguments as in the proof of (3.14), we obtain that

$$\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \equiv 0$$

which leads to

$$\frac{p_1}{p_2} e^{\alpha - \beta} = k\frac{B_1}{B_2} = k\frac{f_{c_1}}{f_{c_2}}, \tag{3.36}$$

where k is a nonzero complex constant. By this (3.1) and (3.2), we have

$$(1 - c) f f_{c_1} f_{c_2} = q(f_{c_2} - k f_{c_1}). \tag{3.37}$$

If $k \neq 1$, then by applying Clunie lemma to (3.37), we deduce the contradiction $T(r, f_{c_i}) = S(r, f)$. Hence, $k = 1$ and from the equation (3.36), we conclude that $f_{c_1} \equiv f_{c_2}$ which exclude the hypothesis of our theorem. This shows that at leats one of $f(z) f(z + c_1) - q(z)$ and $f(z) f(z + c_2) - q(z)$ has infinitely many zeros.

References

[1] Z. X. Chen, *Complex differences and difference equations*, Mathematics Monograph series 29, Science Press, Beijing, 2014.

[2] Z. X. Chen, *On value distribution of difference polynomials of meromorphic functions*. Abstr. Appl. Anal. 2011, Art. ID 239853, 9 pp.

[3] Y. M. Chiang, S. J. Feng, *On the Nevanlinna characteristic of* $f(z + \eta)$ *and difference equations in the complex plane,* Ramanujan J. 16 (2008), no. 1, 105–129.

[4] G. G. Gundersen, *Estimates for the logarithmic derivative of a meromorphic function, plus similar estimates*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 37 (1988), no. 1, 88–104.
[5] R. G. Halburd, R. J. Korhonen, *Difference analogue of the lemma on the logarithmic derivative with applications to difference equations,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. 314 (2006), no. 2, 477–487.
[6] R. G. Halburd, R. J. Korhonen, *Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 31 (2006), no. 2, 463–478.
[7] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic functions*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs Clarendon Press, Oxford 1964.
[8] W. K. Hayman, *Picard values of meromorphic functions and their derivatives*, Ann. of Math. (2) 70 (1959), 9–42.
[9] I. Laine, *Nevanlinna theory and complex differential equations*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, 15. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1993.
[10] I. Laine and C. C. Yang, *Value distribution of difference polynomials*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. 83 (2007), no. 8, 148–151.
[11] K. Liu and L. Z. Yang, *Value distribution of the difference operator*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 92 (2009), no. 3, 270–278.
[12] N. Li and L. Yang, *Value distribution of certain type of difference polynomials*, Abstr. Appl. Anal. 2014, Art. ID 278786, 6 pp.
[13] W. Lü, N. Liu, C. Yang and C. Zhuo, *Notes on value distributions of* $ff^{(k)} - b$, Kodai Math. J. 39 (2016), no. 3, 500–509.